EUROPEAN SOCIALISM AND THE COLONIAL QUESTION (1848-1918)

Thomas R. Fedyszyn

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA 93940

European Socialism and the Colonial Question (1848-1918)

by

Thomas R. Fedyszyn

An essay submitted to The Johns Hopkins University
in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts

Baltimore, Maryland

1975

T168200

Thesis
F25158

DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY
NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY, CA

ABSTRACT

This essay examines the manner in which the colonial question was viewed by the socialist movement in Europe, beginning with Karl Marx, and culminating with the First World War. It is an attempt not only to classify the various socialist views toward this subject, but to suggest and analyze the motivations which produced these outlooks.

Socialism, as an ideology, presented a major obstacle to the early socialists when confronting the colonial question. Though it implied a sense of universal equality and "unity of the oppressed", its economic laws were derived from and applicable only to advanced, industrial states. Socialism, in its European form, was an irrelevant tool of analysis. Additionally, socialism was an ideology signally unsuited to deal with foreign policy.

European socialists were further confounded by having to formulate policy in a national milieu. They were forced to engage in practical politics and make political compromises, not required of the ideology's early theorists. Also, the European constituencies, whose support was necessary, were highly nationalistic, and even jingoistic, in the "Golden Age

of Imperialism."

All socialists examined, excluding Lenin and Karski, manifested a sense of European superiority toward the colonies, which lead to a "Western" view of the colonial question. That is, the morality of any colonial policy was determined by its ultimate effect on Europe. The colonies were treated only as economic entities.

The Western "reformists" hope to utilize their "positive colonial policy" to enrich Europe and to provide superior colonial management. Many socialist militarists and national chauvinists also aligned with the reformist position. However, a small faction of reformists also show an inclination to utilize this policy to improve the economic conditions of the colonial natives, by taking an active responsibility for them.

The Western "orthodox" faction rejected colonialism "in principle", because colonies were viewed as a source of wealth, which could be used to buy off class-consciousness in Europe. Recognition of the colonies would have endangered their belief in the inevitability of revolution. Therefore, they chose a "policy of avoidance", and hoped to get the entire socialist movement to disavow it, by tying colonialism to militarism.

An "Eastern" view of colonialism, as put forth by Lenin, lends significance to international equality and the ability

of Asiatics to engage in purposeful political activity. The revolution in the East attains priority, in this view.

It is concluded that the Western views suffer from the cultural relativism which inheres. However, all views fail in conveying a sense of selfless charity for the oppressed colonials. All socialist attitudes are products of expedient political tactics, aimed solely at enhancing the political position of socialism within a European state. The colonial question, socialism's first opporiunity to convey this sense of universalism inherent in the philosophy, became an instrument of practical local politics.

Socialism developed as a combined reaction to the social injustice emanating from early European industrialization and a sense of ability to master economic difficulty through technology. The cause, properly managed, could provide the cure. The illness to be treated was inequality. The oppressed masses, themselves the creator of all value through their labor, were awarded less economic benefit than they deserved.

Though socialists have perennially disputed the specific form of equality (that of opportunity or condition; economic, political or social) to be achieved and the tactics (revolution or reform; production or distribution) to be employed, an undeniable egalitarianism pervaded the philosophy.

However, socialism developed and operated within the confines of nation-states, and was the product of an industrial Western-European culture. Socialists implicitly acknowledged that the popular acceptance, which they required to take governmental power, would derive from local, European electorates, within the national framework.

The question of policy toward colonial areas juxtaposed

the two conflicting characteristics of European socialism, universal egalitarianism and national parochialism, for the first time. An ideological, as well as practical, dilemma for socialism was created by the problem of colonialism. The original socialist thinkers were conditioned exclusively by local (European) phenomena and addressed the problems of the masses only in industrial states.[1] Tropical colonies were originally not an issue. Factories, coal mines, and urban slums were the target of socialist polemics. By the late nineteenth century, the "coloureds" of the colonies had to be incorporated into this system of beliefs. In sum, the socialists of the late nineteenth century were faced with the necessity of dealing with the colonial question in a charitable and egalitarian manner because of their ideology. Yet, this same ideology was unsuited to incorporate non-industrial masses. Additionally, for tactical political purposes, the ideology had to remain a palatable alternative for the local European workers.

This essay will attempt to analyze the confused and contradictory position toward the colonial question taken by the leading European socialists, through the First World War.

1. Albert Fried and Ronald Sanders, ed., Socialist Thought, (Garden City, New York, 1964,) The introduction pp.1-13 treats this point directly, but the selected readings of the early socialists are in concurrence.

The significance of this issue resides in the fact that it presented the first opportunity for socialism to project its principle of human equality beyond the domestic politics of industrialized states.

Fittingly, Karl Marx was the first socialist to address the matter of colonialism. His first realization that European socialism was not developing in a vacuum was found in his retort to Proudhon, The Poverty of Philosophy. In it, he alluded to a theme that subsequently permeated European socialist thought: that every international phenomenon must be analyzed by its effect on European politics. He evaluated the role of the "millions of workers condemned to perish in the East Indies," as ameliorating the condition of the British proletariat by providing the latter with "three years of prosperity out of ten."[2]

This attitude, expressed in 1846, is the core of what will loosely be labelled the "Western" outlook on the colonial question. That is, colonial policy must be judged on the basis of its effect on the political situation within the European colonizer. Because Europe was superior and more

2. Karl Marx, The Poverty of Philosophy, (New york, 1967,) p. 110.

important, it took priority over the colonies.

Marx's condescending attitude toward non-Europeans was evident in much of his writing, but especially in the Communist Manifesto of 1848. Here, he discussed the spread of capitalism and remarked that, just as the country is dependent on the towns, "so it has made barbarian countries dependent on the civilized, ... the East on the West."[3]

It was in 1853, when Marx wrote a series of articles for the New York Daily Tribune, that his early position on colonialism was elucidated. His dealing with Indian society was characterized by an emphasis on its backwardness and stagnation. His primary point was that all colonies eventually had to endure the process of industrialization. Thus, the introduction of British rule and the concomitant universalization of capital, were a progressive and necessary step toward eventual international socialism.

A sense of European superiority pervaded Marx's early work on colonialism. He explicitly confirmed this in an 1853 article:

> "Arabs, Turks, Tartars, Mongols, who had successively overrun India, soon became Hinduized, the barbarian conquerors being, by an eternal law of history, conquered themselves by the superior civilization of their subjects.

3. Karl Marx, Manifesto of the Communist Party, (New York, 1937,) p. 13.

> The British were the first conquerors superior ... to the Hindu civilization.[4]

The core theory underlying his argument was that capitalist development in Europe was creating a single world economic system, with which all regions would inevitably join. They would have to be "Europeanized" before they could be socialized. Capitalism was pictured as the unstoppable force capable of bringing the mightiest (barbarian) civilizations to their knees. Marx remarked of China, that it was "a gratifying fact that the oldest and most unshakable empire on earth should within eight years have been brought by the cotton bales of the English Bourgeois to the eve of a social revolution."[5]

The root cause of oriental stagnation was traced to the "Village System," which in Marx's opinion of 1853, had to be eliminated. These villages were contaminated by the distinctions of caste and slavery, and they subjugated the creative talents of man. Marx added, that we must not

> forget that these idyllic village communities, inoffensive though they may appear, had always been the solid

4. All of Marx's articles to the New York Daily Tribune plus much of his and Engel's correspondence are compiled in On Colonialism, (New York, 1972.) This selection was taken from an article entitled "The Future Results of British Rule in India," p. 82.

5. Karl Marx, Marx on China, (London, 1951,) p. 52.

> foundation of Oriental despotism, that they restrained the human mind within the smallest possible camp, making it the unresisting tool of superstition, enslaving it beneath traditional rules, depriving it of all grandeur and historical energies.[6]

In January, 1859, Marx gave a summary of his method that indicated the exact relationship of the economic process to the historical process. He saw four stages: "In broad outlines, Asiatic, ancient, feudal, and modern bourgeois modes of production can be designated as progressive epochs in the economic formation of society."[7] This lowest, "Asiatic Mode" was a product of both the village system and climatic conditions. The creation of private property in land and universal capitalization would play the major role of this mode's dissolution.

Britain's role in India, thus, had a dual nature. By introducing capitalism, it would introduce private property (which lays the foundation for socialism, since private property cannot be abolished before it is fully developed[8])

6. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, On Colonialism, (New York, 1972,) p. 40.

7. Karl Marx, Selected Works, Vol. I, (New York, 1972,) p. 363

8. Shlomo Avinieri, The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx, (Cambridge, 1970,) p. 168.

and Indian modernization. This would, in turn, improve internal communications and irrigation, and facilitate eventual political unity. At that point, the economic substructure necessary for a true proletarian revolution would have been created. The growth of capitalism, through the destruction of Asiatic society, would necessarily sow the seeds of its own destruction. England would, unwittingly, become a "tool of history" accelerating the grouth of international class consciousness.

Secondarily, Marx's anti-Russian bias was also manifest in his discussion of India. Though he did not give England the unqualified right to control India, he suggested that British rule was superior to "India conquered by the Turk or by the Russian."[9]

However, Marx also made allusions to another theme common to all later European socialists: that colonialism has historically produced numerous evils because of the malevolence of its capitalist administrators. Perhaps English rule was preferable to Russian, but the "whole rule of Britain in India was swinish, and is to this day."[10] The objection was not to colonialism, per se, but to an inability to govern

9. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Op. cit., p. 81.

10. Ibid., p. 315, Letter From Marx to Engels, June 14, 1853.

efficiently and humanely. These maledictions arose from the inherently selfish interests of capitalists, and the implication was that beter administration could make a colonial policy beneficial to both metropole and colony.

The Marxian position toward colonialism was apparently one of reluctant acceptance, recognizing that this policy was a necessary evil. Though coercion and injustice have been its concomitants, colonial practices were viewed as the only potential progressive forces which could drag the "Orient" through the successive modes of production. The analysis was exclusively economic and tended to project economic theories derived from European states directly on to the colonies.

Subsequently, Marx reversed his position on the economic effect of India on England, but unfailingly analyzed the situation in European terms. In 1857, Marx wrote to Engels, that the military and naval expenses of defending large colonies were becoming an economic burden on England, and that "this dominion ... threatens to cost quite as much as it can ever be expected to come to."[11] However, these expenses were viewed as welcome forces accelerating the inevitable crises caused by the contradictions of capitalism. Marx

11. Ibid., pp. 171-172, taken from "British Incomes in India," published in the New York Daily Tribune, September 21, 1857.

noted further, that "with the drain of men and bullion which it must cost the English, India is now our best ally . . ."[12] The colonies helped to create an economic situation which stimulated class consciousness in Euope, and enhanced the likelihood of a socialist revolution.

Until 1867, the European Revolution was not only considered more important than any activity in the colonies, but it was also felt that it must necessarily occur earlier. That is, only when socialists were in power in the mother country could colonies be managed properly and guided toward independence and socialism. However, Marx revised this temporal sequence in his consideration of the Irish question. He expressed the view that the English working class would never accomplish any worthwhile political activity until the British political system was shaken by the loss of Ireland. Though his opinion was still decidedly Western, this compromise opened the door to all the "Asiocentric" visions of the world revolution, which were to be propagated (by Mao, for example) once Asia had ceased to be a mere economic object of analysis.[13]

12. Ibid., p. 321, Letter From Marx to Engels, January 14, 1858.

13. Helene d'Encasse Carrere and Stuart R. Schramm, Marxism and Asia, (Baltimore, 1969,) p. 15.

This new attitude, which insisted on the primacy of the Western Revolution, but allowed for some political activity (i.e. national revolution, independence) in the colonies at an earlier date, will be labelled the "adapted Western" outlook on the colonial question.

Throughout his life, Marx's judgment of the colonial question was removed from moralistic anti-imperialism. The management and excesses of colonialism were deplored, but it was substantially defended as a progressive economic step toward international socialism. His unswerving belief in the omnipotence of capitalism, and its ability to alter the ossified societies of the Orient, bolstered his economic interpretation of the phenomenon.

The colonial examples employed by Marx fell into both European (Ireland, Poland) and tropical (India, Burma, China) classes. Both groups were consistently analyzed as they affected their parent stated, but only the former were considered potential national entities by Marx. Though he eventually terminated his disdain for the tropical colonies and the "Asiatic Mode of Production," Marx never explicitly acknowledged their intrinsic right to independence or equality.

Though Frederick Engels, Marx's counterpart, spent even less time writing on the colonial question, he introduced

several lines of analysis on the subject which were to be often repeated. Near Marx's death in 1882, Engels wrote to the next arbiter of Marxian dogma, Karl Kautsky, specifically on the colonial question.[14]

He, too, divided the colonies into two separate groups, those occupied by a white European population and those occupied by "natives." The former were considered responsible enough to achieve independence with no assistance, while the latter "must be taken over for the time being by the (European) proletariat and led" toward eventual independence.

Engels' attitude toward colonies was definitely of the "Western" variety, though he evolved into roughly the same position Marx took in later life. As of 1882, the idea that the bourgeois-national revolution of the colonies might actually precede the establishment of socialism in Europe never occurred to Engels. The capitalist development of the colonies was considered progressive for the backward areas, but would nave no direct effect on world affairs.[15] However, by 1894, Engels readily admitted that this link did exist and that the "conquest of China by capitalism will . . . furnish the impulse

14. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Op. cit., p. 341, letter from Frederick Engels to Karl Kautsky, September 12, 1882.

15. Demetrio Boersner, The Bolsheviks and the National and Colonial Question 1917-1928, (Geneva, 1957,) p. 25.

for the overthrow of capitalism in Europe."[16]

His main colonial concern, earlier in life, was that the additional wealth supplied by dependencies would retard the European Revolution. This analysis was the cornerstone around which "orthodox" Marxists were to predicate their anti-colonial polemics. Essentially, Engels observed that the English proletariat showed a propensity to "gaily share in the feast of England's monopoly of the world market and the colonies," thereby inproving their economic position. This development belies Marx's theory of constantly increasing misery, which insisted that the workers' level of both absolute and relative deprivation were continually being aggravated. It is this situation which facilitated the development of class consciousness, which impelled the Socialist Revolution. If the proletariat could be "bought off" by the bourgeoisie, the revolution became even more distant. In 1882, Engels noted that the lack of class consciousness in England was almost at a critical level, when he wrote: "you ask me what the English workers think about colonial policy? Well, exactly the same as they think about politics in general: The same

16. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Op. cit., p. 347, letter from Frederick Engels to F.A. Sorge, November 10, 1894.

as the bourgeois think."[17]

He hinted in other writings that Marx's concept of the "aristocracy of labor" was being realized, specifically because of the possession of colonies. This regressive trend could only be ended by dissolving all ties with one's dependencies. Though orthodox Marxists rallied around this analysis, Engels' superior attitude toward the tropical colonies provided "reformist" socialists of a later date, with a rationale to justify a policy of tutelage and paternalism. Yet, throughout his writing, is found his European sense of superiority and the priority of European political development.

The outlook of Marx and Engels on colonialism was not, in itself, of great significance in contemporary politics. Neither theorist was actively commanding a national political party. Yet, their ideas certainly held great sway among the growing number of European socialists, especially in their native Germany.

Eventually, debate on the colonial question would not only be carried on in Marxian terminology, but policies were deemed acceptable largely on their substantiation by previous pronouncements by Marx or Engels. Indeed, the roots of opposing colonial policies could be found in their writings.

17. Ibid., p. 341, letter from Engels to Kautsky, September 12, 1882.

With the inception of the International Workingmen's Association (I.W.A.) of 1864, Marx was accepted as the spiritual head of socialism, and remained in control of the body's General Council throughout its short life. His attempt to inject a sense of solidarity of the oppressed in the I.W.A. was apparent in the First Colonial Pronouncement of International Socialism, aimed at the political equality of a race enslaved by oppressive colonizers: the Negro slaves of the Confederacy during the American Civil War. President Lincoln was described as the "single minded son of the working class, who was destined to lead the country through the matchless struggle for the rescue of an unchained race."[18] The I.W.A. urged all workers to endure the hardships of the cotton crisis, until the oppressed slaves were freed.

It is worthwhile to note that the First International was never engaged in any activity which required that it be consistent with this principle. The "alliance of the oppressed" was rarely invoked, in fact, beyond national boundaries. This was also an ominous foreboding for future socialists.

18. Minutes of the General Council of the First International cited in Julius Braunthal, History of the International 1864-1914, (New York, 1967,) p. 306.

The I.W.A. did not succeed for many reasons, including the lack of financial support from German socialists under LaSalle. He reasoned that the oppressed worders of France were not deserving of help from the German proletariat. Also, the ongoing struggle of the "anti-authoritarian" faction of Bakunin and Proudhon resisted the demand of the Marxists to centralize the organization of the body. In 1872, for fear of losing control of the association to the anarchists, Marx spitefully moved its headquarters to New York, where it was certain to fade into oblivion. The International formally expired in 1876.

Shortly after the demise of the International, both socialism and colonialism rapidly grew in importance in European politics. Socialist parties, increasingly under Marxian influence, were founded in every section of Europe in the 1870's and early 80's. Simultaneously, the "Golden Age" of Imperialism and ruthless division of all the tropical land of the world, was in its incipient stage.

The numerous causes of this sudden surge of imperialism have been analyzed in detail elsewhere,[19] but there exist

19. William L. Langer (The Diplomacy of Imperialism) offers the most comprehensive and convincing group of reasons behind this expansive drive, pp. 67-99. However, D. K. Fieldhouse

sufficiently few common causes, so that the success of early socialism can be considered distinct from it. Much of the popularity of the socialist movement derived from the fact that it was an uncompromising spokesman for the worker, which would agitate for meaningful internal social and political reform. Universal suffrage and increased wages were part of the platform of virtually every party. The social Democrats rejected the evils of industrialism and insisted on a more equitable distribution of wealth within the country in question. Essentially, socialism was an internal force, with almost exclusively domestic, short-term goals. This was the case, both in its initial theoretical conception, and in practice, since its power ultimately rested on the mass support of a country's workers. It was an ideology signally unsuited to deal with foreign affairs, since its final goal (as Marx would have it) was the destruction of the nation-state. August Bebel, a later head of the German Social Democrats, stated succinctly the socialist aversion to international affairs: "I know that a great number of our comrades, of they so much as hear about foreign policy, prefer to shrug their shoulders.

(Economics and Empire) labels these explanations "Eurocentric," and embarks on a "peripheral," though less convincing,solution. A. P. Thornton (Doctrines of Imperialism) groups the various reasons into three divisions: Doctrines of Power, Doctrines of Profit, and Doctrines of Civilization.

With some justification."[20]

Because of the growth of the socialist movement in the 1880's, it necessarily assumed a role in the practical politics of most European states. Politicians, rather than theoreticians,assumed leadership of most of these movements. Unfortunately, many of the European states in which socialism was prominent had adopted foreign policies which entailed colonialism by the turn of the century. Thus, socialism was confronted with incorporating this "foreign" substance into its doctrine, if it was to remain a relevant political force.

The leading socialist movement of Europe was formed in Germany under LaSalle[21] in the 1860's. However, LaSalle's party dogmatized the popular conviction that force and violence could not assist any radical cause. Rather, its policy chose the state as the means to achieve political democracy. In fact, LaSalle was a Prussian who supported nationalism and federalism, under Prussian domination, for all Germans. His hatred

20. August Bebel, in an address to the Erfurt Congress of the German S.P.D., 1891, cited in James Joll, The Second International 1889-1914, (New York, 1956,) p. 114.

21. LaSalle's original mane was Lasal, but he decided early in life to change it to this French form, since he felt that anything French imparted a revolutionary quality.

for the German Progressives often forced him into alliances with the Conservatives in the Reichstag.

The Bavarians, William Liebknecht and August Bebel, headed the Marxist, anti-Prussian wing of the party. In 1869, they seceded and formed the German Social Democratic Party (S.P.D.), based on the more revolutionary, Marxian doctrine.

The two factions united under the Gotha Programme of 1875, with the LaSalleans out-numbering the Eisenachers (Marxists) by 16,000 to 9,000. This Program was totally reformist in nature, with only minor concessions made to the Marxists. Marx personally protested vigorously from London, upon reading the fundamental policy adopted at Gotha.[22] By 1875, the united party polled in excess of 350,000 votes and had nine representatives in the Reichstag.

Bismarck outlawed the Socialist Party in 1878 and simultaneously embarked on a policy of conservative paternalism and social reform. The Socialists adopted a passive attitude toward this persecution and continued to attract voters to the party. By 1890, when the anti-Socialist Laws were repealed, the S.P.D. was polling almost 1.5 million votes.

22. Marx's Critique of the Gotha Programme was originally his marginal notes written on a copy of this programme, sent to him in England, for criticism. His critique was so extensive and vituperative, that it became a work unto itself.

The Engels-inspired Erfurt Programme was adopted in 1890 by the S.P.D., but the revolutionary rhetoric it contained, was just that. The party, Carlton J.H. Hayes maintains, increasingly attracted members of the German trade unions, along with a considerable segment of the middle class.[23] This inconsistency provoked interminable debate between the orthodox and reformist factions of the S.P.D., which had its repercussions in colonial policy.

Edward Bernstein, the father of German Revisionism, first suggested that the S.P.D. adopt a colonial policy similar to the pro-Imperial Liberals of Great Britain because "socialism is its (Liberalism's) legitimate heir, not only in chronological sequence, but also in its spiritual qualities."[24] Such a policy would be highly nationalistic, and by injecting a strong element of paternalism, would make imperialism a more palatable and humane policy.

Bernstein advocated outright imperialism, primarily because it would benefit Germany and the German working class by providing the requisite raw materials and security for an incipient

23. Carlton J.H. Hayes, "The Influence of Political Tactics on Socialist Theory in Germany 1867-1914," in Charles E. Merriam and Harry E. Barnes, ed., A History of Political Theories, (New York, 1924,) p. 289.

24. Edward Bernstein, Evolutionary Socialism: A Criticism and Affirmation, (New York, 1909,) p. 149.

major-power. He noted that Germany imported a considerable amount of colonial produce, and that the time might come when "it will be desirable to draw . . . these products from our own colonies."[25] Since, he reasoned, it was not reprehensible to enjoy the produce of tropical plantations, it could not be immoral to cultivate such plantations themselves.

For fear that China would come under the control of Germany's colonial adversaries, Bernstein proclaimed that "in all questions concerning China, Germany should have a word to say."[26] Germany's acquisition of Kiaochow Bay was defended as allowing her a stronghold to protect China from either dependence on Russia or division by other European states. Germany, he continued, "could nake her influence felt at any time on the situation of things in China, instead of being obliged to content herself with belated protests."[27]

He justifies colonialism on the grounds that savages had only a conditional right to land they occupied, since the "higher civilization ultimately can claim a higher right," because only it can properly cultivate the land.[28] He cited

25. Ibid., p. 172.

26. Ibid., p. 173.

27. Ibid., p. 174.

28. Ibid., p. 179.

Marx in his defense, noting that it was obligatory that societies improve the land and its production, of lose claim to it.[29]

Because he had explicitly denied Marx's theory of increasing misery, he insisted that the acquisition of colonies would not impede the realization of socialism by providing more wealth. Indeed, this process would accelerate the evolution toward socialism through amelioration of the condition of the German proletariat. The revolution was an illusory dream, with or without colonies. At worst, Bernstein argued, socialists should treat the colonial question without prejudice, since colonies would have little immediate effect on the social conditions of Germany.

In addition, he demanded that a socialist colonial policy not beinjurious to the natives of the colonies, a concept novel to contemporary socialists. However, he took a much more sanguine view of capitalist colonialism than other socialists, noting that present policy had rarely hindered the natives in their enjoyment of life. The only obvious flaw he perceived in colonialism was that it aggravated naval and military chauvinism, which could lead to war.[30]

29. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. II, (Moscow, 1959,) pp. 652-653.

30. Bernstein, Op. cit., p. 177.

Though all facets of Bernsteinian Revisionism were officially rejected at the national Congress of Hanover (1889), many German socialists remained loyal followers of Bernstein. Some were prepared to adopt an even more extreme nationalistic and paternalistic colonial policy. Quessel urged that Germany and Great Britain conclude an agreement for the peaceful division of the world.[31] Edouard David suggested that colonialism become an "integral part of the universal cultural aims of the socialist movement."[32]

Within the camp of German socialism was also the most revolutionary group of orthodox Marxists, who opposed Bernstein at every turn. Led by Kar Liebknecht (William's son) and Rosa Luxemburg, they derived a position on colonialism antithetical to that of the reformists.

Imperialism was viewed as the inherent outgrowth of the corrupt capitalist society. It was considered to be the last stage, or ultimate contradiction, of capitalism, which would destroy itself when the last bit of territory was consumed.[33] Colonialism was not an accidental result, but was the inevitable

31. Paul Frolich, Rosa Luxemburg: Her Life and Work, (New York, 1969,) p. 194.

32. Ibid.

33. Boersner, Op. cit., p. 43.

consequence of profit-seeking economies. In a sinister way, the ultimate effect of colonialism was "progressive." The German Marxists averred that colonialism provided the "material conditions for the destruction of capitalism and the abolition of class society. In this sense, imperialism, too, is working in our interest."[34]

Every aspect of the colonialization process was, however, reprehensible, and to be condemned as unalterably evil. Karl Liebknecht propounded a direct connection between colonialiam and militarism. Most socialists, including Bernstein, admitted that colonial rivalries increased the tension, which induced European states to engage in arms races, making general war more probable. Colonialism, therefore, assumed an even worse quality, because it could lead to the loss of European lives, as well as heavier taxation of the European worker.

Rosa Luxemburg, while accepting Liebknecht's thesis, developed a more complicated analysis of the colonial and national question. In The Accumulation of Capital, she put forth her economic theory of the phenomenon. Capitalism, she held, could continue to expand as long as there were non-capitalist regions to supply resources and to act as markets for European

34. Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, and Franz Mehring, The Crisis In German Social Democracy (The Junius Pamphlet,) (New York, 1918,) p. 124.

overproduction. When this was no longer possible, capitalism would collapse.[35]

In her political writings, Luxemburg characterized the "imperial stage" as an aggravated condition of capitalist society, which had to be defined by the effects it had on Europe. She hoped to use this international issue to galvanize the S.P.D. into advocating more radical political action, and to serve as a "nutcracker in which to break the party's shell of self-absorption."[36]

Thus, she was outspoken in her criticism of Germany's imperial adventures into China (1900) and Morocco (1905), but never developed a political policy for colonial countries, nor gave the colonies any recommendations as to how they might resist this subjugation. Imperialism was simply the instrument which could create the requisite revolutionary spirit in the S.P.D. and the German workers - a means of curing the party's lethargy.

By 1905, she was convinced that imperialism had permeated every corner of the world to such a degree that national struggle in the colonies was no longer possible.[37] In fact, nationalism

35. Rosa Luxemburg, The Accumulation of Capital, (London, 1951,) passim.

36. J. P. Nettl, Rosa Luxenburg, (London, 1966,) p. 536.

had an evil effect on European workers, since the proletariat merely followed the leadership of the national bourgeoisie. Thus, excluding several polemics condemning the evils of colonialism, she tended to ignore the colonial question, except when exploiting it for domestic purposes. Her activity was invariably concentrated on the European revolutionary struggle. Time spent trying to ameliorate the condition of the colonies, as long as Europe was in the clutches of capitalism, was time lost. Her position was later summarized in the Junius Brochure: "So long as capitalist states exist, there can be no national self-determination, either in war of peace."[38]

Karl Kautsky, the most influential Marxist theorist of his day, clung to what might be called a "strategy of attrition," with respect to the colonial question. He foresaw a growing socialist force eventually overwhelming the imperialists. This inevitability allowed him to continue to preach his self-proclaimed "orthodox" rhetoric, while supporting reformist activities. His profound optimism in "scientific socialism" led him to the conclusion that the colonial problem would vanish, if ignored.

The revolutionary Marxists of Germany, thus, formulated

37. Boersner, Op. cit., p. 43.

38. Liebknecht, Luxemburg, and Mehring, Op. cit., p. 95.

the basic policy of all subsequent "Western" orthodox Marxists, much as the German Revisionists did for the "Western" Reformists, with respect to colonial policy. The orthodox faction condemned colonialism not only because its management was inefficient and brutal; they opposed it in principle as well. It was recognized that colonialism aggravated the contradictions of capitalism, but its collapse was inevitable, at any rate. Militarism and war, the concomitants of colonialism, were considered injurious to the local population, and a force deleterious to the outbreak of revolution. The logic was simple: war galvanized the nationalist spirit and offered an excuse to repress the socialists.

Their primary aim was always the European Revolution, and the colonies were only a distraction. Further, activity in the colonies was fruitless, since progress was hopeless without the European Revolution. Sympathy abounded for the colonies, but no policy for them was formulated, because the problem would dissipate as capitalism self-destructed.

The German Social Democrats, as a group, first discussed the colonial question at the Mainz Congress of 1900. The eventuating resolution closely resembled the position of the orthodox revolutionaries, with only minor deviations. Colonialism was judged to have originated because of the insatiable

demands for markets and investment outlets by the bourgeoisie. This practice was inherently ruthless, unjust, and coercive, and made the "exploiting elements" more savage than the natives. The Congress demanded that the rights of all people be preserved and that only instruction and good example could lead the colonies toward independence.[39]

The British socialist movement dates its origins to 1882 and the formation of the Social Democratic Federation (S.D.F.) by H. M. Hyndman. This Marxist party was joined, the next year, by the Fabian Society. In 1893, Keir Hardie created the Scottish-based Independent Labout Parth (I.L.P.).

British socialism developed a different character than that on the continent. England's early development of industrialization had apparently created pressures for reform on the British political system (e.g., the Chartists,) prior to the acceptance of Marxist revolutionary rhetoric on the continent. By the late nineteenth century, most Britons had been successfully diverted from revolutionary tactics by these reforms. Thus, even Hyndman's S.D.F., orthodox by British standards, showed little flair for revolution. Joll remarks that British socialists were "somewhat incomprehensible to

39. Braunthal, Op. cit., p. 308.

most European socialists, and lay outside the mainstream of the movement, sometimes rather consciously, and even regretfully."[40] This accounts for the fact that despite vast support and undeniable interest in the colonial question, their influence in International Congresses was minimal.

Through its "permeation" tactics, the Fabian Society had a significant effect on the entire British socialist movement. The leaders of every major socialist group were at least nominally Fabians, as were five of eight members of the Executive Council of the Labour Representative Committee, a synthesis of the three groups (Fabians, I.L.P. and S.D.F.) which eventually became the Labour Party, in 1906.[41]

Before the outbreak of the Boer War in October, 1899, British socialists paid no heed to foreign policy. They were, in the words of E. R. Pease, "derisively regarded as experts in the politics of the parish pump."[42] This insular view was interrupted only by random attacks on some aspects of British policy in India. However, the South African War forced the

40. James Joll, The Second International 1889-1914, (New York, 1956,) p. 122.

41. A. M. McBriar, Fabian Socialism and English Politics 1884-1918, (Cambridge, 1962,) pp. 307-346 passim.

42. Edward R. Pease, The History of the Fabian Society, (London, 1963,) p. 128.

socialists to deal with the colonial question.

Hyndman's S.D.F. had earlier condemned the Jameson Raid on the Transvaal. However, shortly after his speech at the Paris Congress of 1900, in which he labelled England the aggressor, he reversed his position because of the unanimous anti-British reaction.[43] His patriotic tendencies prevailed. The S.D.F., then not only reverted to a pro-British policy in South Africa, but supported British militarism, as a necessity for survival. Hyndman declared that "our existence as a nation of free men depends on our supremacy at sea. This can be said of no other people of the present day. However much we socialists are naturally opposed to armaments, we must, however, recognize facts."[44] The use of force, therefore, was condoned for nationalistic reasons, but also viewed as a tool to strengthen and develop the common good and human happiness, if applied properly by an enlightened people.[45]

Though Hyndman had consistently attacked England's policy in India, he never contested the British right to colonize.

43. Chushichi Tsuzuki, H. M. Hyndman and British Socialism, (New York, 1961,) p. 130.

44. Hyndman's quotation from Justice, May 31, 1898, cited in Bernstein, Op. cit., fn. p. 179.

45. H. M. Hyndman, The Historical Basis of Socialism, (London, 1883,) p. 472.

He possessed first-hand knowledge of the effects of colonialism on the sub-continent, but favored some form of Indian ties with Britain.[46] He simply desired a more equitable partnership between the two actors.

Later, his opinion of the quality of British rule grew less favorable and he acknowledged that the "mischief" Britain had wrought, outweighed any reforms. Trade had been opened with bloodshed. But the eventual reason that he offered for severing ties with India in 1919 were consummately "Western." His first concern was with England, as he noted: "The possession of India has been a curse to England, alike in her domestic and foreign affairs. Democracy at home has greatly suffered by the maintenance of despotism abroad."[47] Further, he decried the fact that the defense of the colonies fell squarely on the backs of the British working-class taxpayers.

Hyndman's goals were largely reformist,and his stance on the colonial question closely mirrored that of Bernstein. He considered the effects of colonies on the metropole, and displayed a strong current of nationalism. He was orthodox only in British socialism.

46. Tsuzuki, Op. cit., p. 127.

47. H. M. Hyndman, The Awakening of Asia, (New York, 1919,) p. 271.

The Independent Labour Party initially denounced the British intervention and attributed the cause of the Boer War to capitalist profit-seeking. However, Robert Blatchford, the Party's most influential member, immediately threw his weight behind the venture. His socialist newspaper, the Clarion, was the most popular source of socialist opinion in England. He held that a British victory would enhance her wealth, thereby benefitting the masses.[48] Ledebour, a leading German Marxist, accused him of forcing his daughter to play "Rule Britannia" for him every night of the Boer War.[49]

Before the Boer War, the Fabian Society was simply a group of moderate socialist intellectuals, devoted to domestic social and political reform. Their distinctly parochial view, even in the face of the War, was attributed partially to the realization that it would cause a split in the Society.[50] Matters of foreign policy were considered irrelevant. Fabian Tract No. 70 did not mention the colonial question, thereby rendering it a "prohibited degree," not within the purview of Fabian interests.[51] The Fabians had no immediate comment on

48. Tsuzuki, Op. cit., p. 128.

49. Joll, Op. cit., p. 123.

50. McBriar, Op. cit., p. 119.

51. Tract No. 70, published in 1896, entitled "Report on Fabian

the situation.

On December 8, 1899, however, a faction led by S. G. Hobson and J. Ramsay MacDonald urged that the Society adopt a "measure of sympathy" in behalf of the Boers, but the idea was rejected on the grounds of irrelevance. A postal referendum was then conducted in February, 1900, ostensibly to determine whether or not the Society would take a stand on the issue of British imperialism. The reasons for opposing such a stand centered around the fact that it would be futile, as well as irrelevant. This position, advocated by G. B. Shaw, Sidney Olivier, and Sidney Webb, was not, on the surface, a justification of colonial warfare. Shaw's faction won by a 259-217 vote.

However, Margaret Cole's thesis that Shaw was "frankly iritated" by the War, and that the Webbs "did not want to be bothered" is highly questionable in light of the facts. Sidney Webb was known to have opted for an imperial policy, in alliance with the Liberal Imperialists, in order to obtain more influence over their domestic policy.[52] Sidney Olivier was preparing a

Policy," deals with the mission and tactics of the Society, and presents twelve resolutions. The eighth resolution, "war and foreign policy" denounces militarism, but concedes that international solidarity must remain impossible "until the antagonism of social interests . . . is dissolved." No specific mention is made of the British Empire, or colonial policy, in general.

lecture, whose theme was that "small nations which did not seem able to manage their own internal difficultiew were not nations at all, and should be properly policed."[53] On the final day of the referendum, Shaw gave a speech in defense of "imperialism."[54] Thus, Fabian members quite clearly understood that the referendum was a question of imperialism v. anti-imperialism, and still chose to support Shaw. Fifteen members of the minority faction resigned, including Hobson and MacDonald.

It was determined that the Society would then take a formal stand on colonialism. Fabianism and the Empire, the result of this decision, was edited later in 1900 by G. B. Shaw, with the approval of the majority of the Society. Surprisingly, it dwelt primarily on domestic issues, noting that Fabianism was an outgrowth of liberalism. When the exhaustion of liberal ideas lead to the disappearance of liberal leadership, "liberalism would be supplanted in its representation of progressive

52. Bernard Semmel, Imperialism and Social Reform, (Garden City, NewYork, 1968,) p. 57.

53. Margaret Cole, The Story of Fabian Socialism, (Stanford, 1961,) p. 99.

54. Semmel, Op. cit., p. 57. Shaw proclaimed that it was inevitable that the world fall to the empire-creators, and that socialists should not desert English imperialism.

ideas by socialism."[55]

Shaw made his case in support of colonialism from a position of intrinsic British superiority. Though he preferred a World Federation as the ideal colonizer, he suggested that, until this became a reality, "we must accept the most responcible imperial federation available as a substitute for it."[56]

The greatest dangers of empire were perceived as mismanagement, inefficiency, and disruption. Large empires were inherently superior to smaller ones because of their capacity for greater efficiency through specialization. Empires managed by capitalists did not necessarily enhance international civilization, which was the ultimate criterion for empire management. Fabian socialism, it was argued, could produce the "brains and political science" urgently needed to run the

55. George Bernard Shaw, Fabianism and the Empire, (London, 1900,) p. 101.

56. Ibid, p. 24. In 1913, the Fabian position on the uniquely superior quality of British imperialism, is summed up by E. R. Pease, Secretary to the Fabian Society, in an introduction to Thomas Kirkup, A History of Socialism, (London, 1913,): "The majority at Congresses has without reserve condemned the system of establishing colonies in the tropics as merely an extension of the field of exploitation of the capitalist class. This does not refer to the colonial system of England, insofar as it consists in the development of self-governing communities, and the Congresses have perhaps hardly appreciated the value to India of the peace, order, and progress established there under British rule."

colonies.[57] Thus, possessions were not only acceptable (under socialist influence,) but the more numerous, the better.

The Fabians advocated an explicitly bifurcated policy with respect to the colonies. An ethnic superiority was presupposed by the following statement:

> . . . as for parliamentary institutions for native races, that dream has long been disposed of. We thus have two imperial policies: a democratic policy for povinces in which the white colonists are in a large majority, and a bureaucratic policy where the majority consists of coloured natives.[58]

Within tropical colonies, Shaw stressed, certain guarantees must be made to the white inhabitants.

The principle of free trade was invoked as justification for intervention in the affairs of an underdeveloped area. Shaw pointed out that local government must be capable both of keeping peace and enforcing agreements, or lose its legitimacy. At that point, a foreign trading power not only may, but indeed must, set up a viable government.[59] A similar line of reasoning was utilized concerning the right to resources. Those powers which could extract mineral wealth had the obligation to stimulate the world economy by so doing, regardless of their

57. Shaw, Op. cit., p. 93.

58. Ibid., p. 16.

59. Ibid., p. 45.

location.

A final argument for colonialism was purely competitive. Since all other powers are engaging in annexation, Britain must ensure that she was not left behind. The moral dilemma as to whether to leave China alone is answered rhetorically: "but how, if the other powers will not leave her alone?"[60]

After incessant attacks from anti-imperial liberal groups led by J. A. Hobson, the Fabians attempted to dissociate "public-spirited imperialism" from emotional, patriotic jingoism. They insisted that this confusion had given them a bad reputation in foreign policy matters. Gradually conceding this association, they, unobtrusively, ceased making pronouncements in colonial policy until after the creation of their "Research Groups."[61]

In sum, the Fabians insisted on stringent controls in the tropical colonies, ostensibly, to keep them from reverting to a state of anarchic "black slavery." This policy of tutelage and paternalism was aimed at educating the natives to a point where they would deserve independence. Ultimately, most reformist Socialists came to embrace this brand of paternalism. This humaneness was meant to arouse a sense of "public-spirited

60. Ibid., p. 54.

61. McBriar, Op. cit., p. 128-130.

imperialism," and to add to that already pervasive sentiment of national chauvinism implanted by the likes of Seeley and Dilke. In Fabian terms, a colonial policy could be beneficial to the entire world: Europeans would gain additional wealth while the tropical natives could be educated and led toward European-style statehood.

The Labour Representative Committee passed an anti-imperialist resolution at the behest of Keir Hardie during its First Annual Congress in 1901. However, all future resolutions on colonial and foreign policy were considered out of order. At no time did governmental colonial policy provoke any serious disagreement within the L.R.C., or cause it seriously to consider invoking sanctions against the government.[62] The Labour Party, formed in 1906, took no stand on the colonial question.

French socialism is a history of splinter groups rarely able to arrive at complete agreement. Though random socialist candidates polled a substantial percentage of the vote as early as the 1860's, it was not until 1886 that Guesde united the National Federation of Trade Unions under an orthodox Marxist policy. However, socialist factions to the right and left of this party formed shortly thereafter, and became political

62. Ibid., p. 337.

forces to be reckoned with.

R. F. Betts notes that the French colonial empire was amassed in the face of public apathy, if not antipathy.[63] It was not until the turn of the century, when France arranged a treaty with Russia and passed the Finance Law of 1900, that the French public fell wholeheartedly behind this policy. At this time, the only outspoken critic of the French imperial strategy was a majority of the socialists. One notable exception, however, was the eloquent reformist leader, Jean Jaures.

Perhaps the reason that there was little internal debate surrounding the colonial question in the party was that it was preoccupied with the issue of ministerialisme, or whether a socialist could become a minister in a bourgeois government. The Independents, Allemanists, and Possibilists supported Millerand's governmental cabinet post against the onslaught of the Guesdists and Blanquists.

Jaures accepted the Marxist contention that imperialism grew from capitalism, but he could never bring himself to oppose French colonialism, due to his patriotic nationalism. In his newspaper, La Petite Republique, he wrote in May, 1896:

63. Raymond F. Betts, Assimilation and Association in French Colonial Theory 1890-1914, (New York, 1961,) p. 1-5.

> The Law of expansion and conquest to which all peoples yield seems as irresistible as the natural law; even though we denounce eloquently all the villainies, all the corruptions, all the cruelties of the colonial movement, we shall not stop it.[64]

He is mistakenly treated as a vehement anti-colonialist, because of his demand for the emancipation of Cuba, India, and the Philippines, and his criticism of French policy in the Moroccan Crisis of 1905.[65] However, the first response was a reflection of his attitude toward other colonizers, and the latter manifested his overarching fear of war with Germany. With respect to French colonial policy, which did not imply general war, he took a different view.

In 1901, he fully endorsed the Boxer expedition as an excellent example of international co-operation. With respect to China, he noted that "it is impossible to stop (French) expansion, suddenly to halt the vital energies of a nation."[66]

64. Cited in Harold R. Weinstein, Jean Jaures: A Study of Patriotism in the French Socialist Movement, (New York, 1936,) p. 143.

65. Joll, Op. cit., p. 133 and 143, admits an inability to reconcile Jaures' voting record on military credits and his reformist views with his outspoken denunciation of French action in the Moroccan Crisis. He implies that Jaures took this pro-German stand because of his affinity for the German S.P.D.

66. Weinstein, Op. cit., p. 144.

In 1904, he defended inperialism as benefitting both the European workers and natives.

In the 1898 conflict over the Sudan, he insisted on the French right to establish communications between the Congo Basin and the Nile Basin. He demanded that France defend "her dignity and her rights."[67] The 1903 revolt in Morocco prompted him to note that France had to take "moral action" against all Moslems, because of her rightful interests in North Africa.[68] His formal stand on colonialism revolved around ensuring that no colonial conflicts developed into general wars, and providing "humane treatment" for the natives.[69] At no point does he suggest that France emancipate her colonies, but, rather, that she learn to manage them in a more humane fashion, while using them to provide increased wealth for the French worker.

Guesde was conspicuously silent on the colonial question, but viewed with disgust the reformist tactic of providing the government with the "ways and means of conducting this colonial policy," which would likely develop the permanent hazard of war.[70] To Guesde, foreign affairs was only a peripheral matter,

67. Ibid., p. 145.

68. Ibid., p. 144.

69. Ibid.

while the main issue was domestic (labor reforms, as well as governmental collaboration.)

The socialist parties of the Scandinavian states were based on the German model. By 1890, the social democrats of Norway, Sweden, and Denmark had adopted, outright, the German Gotha Programme of 1875. This liberal, reformist trend attracted substantial numbers of votes in each country by the turn of the century. A more radical faction gained control of the party in Norway, due to Norway's more rapid industrialization.[71] However, the colonial question was totally irrelevant to the region, excepting Denmark, which controlled Greenland and the Faeroe Islands.

On the centenary of the French Revolution, the Second International was created in Paris.[72] In its attempt to create a universal socialist force, while retaining its respectability,

70. Aaron Noland, The Founding of the French Socialist Party 1893-1905, (Cambridge, 1956,) p. 170.

71. Walter Galenson, Labor in Norway, (Cambridge, 1949,) pp. 56-60.

72. Actually, two International Socialist Congresses met in Paris in 1889: the Marxists and the Possibilists. The latter group was initially larger, but due to the defection of the British S.D.F. and continual interruptions of the Anarchists, the Marxist group predominated.

the Congress adopted a membership policy which allowed virtually any faction which adhered to the most general socialist principles, while excluding the anarchists.[73] Gerhart Niemeyer has compared the organization of this International with the League of Nations.[74] Each national party was an autonomous unit insisting on the right to determine its own policy. The body had no power to enforce its decisions on a national party. The Secretariat was simply a clearing house for resolutions, while the Permanent Executive Council was powerless. By 1891, Marxism as interpreted by the German Social Democrats, became the lingua franca of the International.

Though the colonial question was of growing, though secondary importance, the International Congresses spent little time on the issue before 1900. A normal order of business was to roundly denounce Britain's colonial policy in India. In the London Congress of 1896, George Lansbury, an I.L.P. member, proposed a resolution, which was unanimously adopted, that all

73. Not only did the anarchists lead to the demise of the First International, through their anti-authoritarianism, but a small faction of bomb-throwing radicals had given the entire group a poor reputation. Most "respectable" socialists feared that the anarchists would give this bad name to the whole movement.

74. Gerhart Niemeyer, "The Second International, 1889-1914" in Milorad Drachkovitch, ed., The Revolutionary Internationals 1864-1943, (Stanford, 1966,) p. 119.

nations have the "right . . . to complete sovereignty." He continued by denouncing colonialism as an expression of capitalism. "With whatever pretexts colonial policies may be justified in the name of religion or civilization," Lansbury resolved, "their sole aim is simply to extend the area of capitalist exploitation in the exclusive interests of the capitalist class."[75]

When the International met again in Septamber, 1900, in Paris, the colonial question was more pressing because of recent events in China and South Africa. It was at this point that the German orthodox faction successfully linked the whole question of imperialism with the arms race and the increased danger of armed conflict. Colonialism was equated with war and increased militarism, making it a much easier concept to renounce. The question of the formulation of a socialist colonial policy was dealt with as a side issue of the Commission discussing world peace and militarism.

The leader of the Dutch Social Democrats, H. Van Kol, resolved that colonialism be rejected without reservation. Since colonialism was an inevitable accompaniment of capitalism, he reasoned, its sole purpose was to provide an "increase in capitalist profit and the maintenance of the capitalist system."[76]

75. Braunthal, Op. cit., p. 309.

The management of imperial powers had committed "crimes and cruelties without number against the native inhabitants of the colonies, subjugated by force of arms." His conclusion was that socialists should fight against colonial expansion in order to end the cruelty inflicted on the natives. Van Kol, thereby, began to show signs of paternalistic concern for the colonial, while rejecting colonialism.

H. M. Hyndman, noted above, concurred with this view in 1900. He protested Britain's action by noting that England's war against the Transvaal filled "us English Socialists with mourning and shame."[77] His colleague, Quelch, added, that "despite all the systematic attempts by capitalist England to corrupt them," the British workers had kept their honor, and not endorsed the war.

At this point, Richard Geraut, representative from the French colony of Guadaloupe, proposed that it was insufficient merely to denounce colonialism. A detailed socialist Program in the colonies should be worked out by the International. All national parties were enjoined to consider the matter between meetings of the International Congress.

The eventual colonial resolution, which was again adopted

76. Ibid.

77. Ibid.

unanimously, averred that recent events (Boer War, Boxer Intervention) had given militarism a new significance. It had become an instrument of imperial expansion and control, thereby accentuating colonial rivalries and accelerating the drive toward general war. The resolution called upon all workers to "oppose with re-doubled strength and vigour both militarism and colonialism." It exhorted socialist parliamentary groups to "vote unfailingly against all estimates for military and naval expenditures or for colonial aggression."[78]

The Paris Congress was the last occasion on which a unanimous position toward colonialism was taken by the European socialists. Until then, all pronouncements of the International were couched in an orthodox, revolutionary rhetoric, decrying imperial abuses and forecasting the eventual doom of capitalism. However, before 1900, the colonial question was not a significant issue in practical socialist politics, and could be treated as mere verbiage. Subsequent to this watershed, those reformists with pro-colonial tendencies (for any number of reasons), were no longer embarassed to assert them. Colonialism was becoming popular domestically in Europe, and socialists were quick to see that their political position could be enhanced by adopting a more realistic, positive colonial policy.

78. Ibid., p. 310.

At the Amsterdam Congress of 1904, a Colonial Commission was formed, with Van Kol and Hyndman as its rapporteurs. The Dutchman admitted that the Commission was not unanimous in its opinions, and was forced to qualify its previous stand on colonialism. Van Kol insisted that colonialism was a consequence of capitalism, but questioned whether it was necessary to condemn every colonial possession, under any circumstances. He answered in the negative:

> The new needs which will make themselves felt after the victory of the working class and its economic emancipation will make the possession of colonies necessary, even under the future socialist system of government. Modern countries will no longer be able to get along without countries furnishing certain raw materials and tropical products indispensable to industry and the needs of humanity, and this will be the case as long as they cannot be procured by the exchange of products of native industry and commerce.[79]

He then expounded on Bernstein's argument concerning the "conditional right to land" of the natives by noting that the interest of all humanity would be served if Europeans were allowed to control the cultivation of the earth. He objected to the hypothesis that some countries would be able to bypass the capitalist mode of production in their economic development.

79. All citations from the Amsterdam Congress are taken from Congres Socialiste Internationale d'Amsterdam des 14-20 Aout 1904, (Brussels, 1904,) pp. 36-82 passim.

He insisted that "the primitive peoples" must be willing to "bear this cross."

The Dutch leader thus concretized the paternalism rationale, thought optimistically predicting a time when "these inferior races . . . will no longer need our tutelage." He passionately asked his colleagues, "Can we abandon hundreds of thousands to infinite misery, to intellectual and moral degradation, instead of protecting them against capitalism?"

This concern with the colonial natives was mitigated substantially, when Van Kol expressed his immediate concern for Europe:

> . . . all that is a question of the far off future. For a long time to come we shall have to protect ourselves against backward forms of production, and from now on, the workers of civilized countries will have to secure themselves against the deadly competition of colonial labor.

His attitude, though paternalistic, remained quintessentially "Western."

He reiterated the socialist pledge to work for colonial self-government, but his resolution demanded that a colony's degree of freedom and independence must approximate its "appropriate stage of development."

Thus, the Van Kol resolution marked a significant retreat from the spontaneous position taken in 1900. Certain consist-

ent themes were apparent, including a denunciation of the excesses of colonial management, a desire for eventual colonial independence, and the relation of colonialism to militarism. But a fundamental condemnation of colonialism in principle, was no longer universally accepted by European socialists. Rather, serious consideration was given to the postulate that socialism could impart the necessary moral guidance and efficient management required to effect a colonial policy both productive for the metropole and benign toward the colonies.

Hyndman's resolution was merely another indictment of British management of India, though it, too, wavered on fundamental condemnation. It called on British workers to support the abandonment of the colonial practices of coercion and subjugation, but never advocated the total abandonment of the colonies. In part, it read:

> The Congress recognizes the right of the inhabitants of civilized countries to settle in lands where the population is at a lower stage of development. However, it condemns most strongly the existing capitalist system of colonial rule. The system results in the oppression of the people of Asia, Africa, etc., by the culturally advanced nations of Europe . . . ..
> The Congress calls on the workers of Great Britain to compel their government to abandon its present infamous and degrading colonial system and to introduce the perfectly practicable system of self-government for the Indian People <u>under English Sovereignty</u>. (italics added)

Despite this somewhat less then "orthodox" view of the

colonial question by the International Socialist Congress of Amsterdam, it appeared that the delegates honestly felt that they represented an unequivocal condemnation of imperialism. A similar situation obtained in the German S.P.D., which felt (but for a few revisionists) that it was an umconpromising revolutionary Marxist party, though its actions characterized it as one of parliamentarism and reform. Neither group admitted, in theory, to the position its activity demanded.

After adopting Hyndman's resolution, which effectively supported the principle of colonization, the socialist delegates rose from their seats, as an expression of sympathy for the Indian people. Tumultuous cheers greeted Dadhabhai Naojori, the founder and president of the Indian National Congress, shortly after the socialists had resolved to continue the extraction of colonial wealth, if ever given the opportunity.

The German Social Democrats had religiously opposed all of Germany's imperial endeavors until this time. A majority sided against governmental policy in the Chinese expedition of 1900, the Baghdad railway concession, and the Moroccan Crisis of 1905. This opposition had no practical effect on policy, since it was usually offered after the fact. However, in December, 1905, Ledebour led an assault on German policy in

South West Africa. An indigenous uprising had been quelled with brutal atrocities by the German occupiers. When the government asked the Reichstag for new credits to finance the campaign, the Social Democrats demurred, along with the Centrist Party. This parliamentary defeat prompted Kaiser Wilhelm to dissolve the Reichstag and to call the "Hottentot Election" of 1907. In it, S.P.D. suffered a signal defeat, losing thirty-eight of its eighty-one members in the Reichstag.[80]

It became readily apparent to a majority of Europe's largest socialist party, that not only was the electorate highly nationalistic, but also that a definite jingoist spirit pervaded the air. The Revisionists were galvanized, suggesting that the "negative colonial policy" of the S.P.D. yield to one that was more "realistic and positive." It appeared that mass socialist support in Germany could not obtain if the party adamantly adhered to a colonial policy of "condemnation in principle."

The Belgian Social Democrats also discussed the necessity of a "realistic" colonial policy, but arrived at a slightly different conclusion. In 1906, King Leopold declared that he

80. Kaiser Wilhelm allegedly tampered with the election returns in order to effect this drastic loss of representation for the S.P.D. The Party garnered 29.2% of the total vote, down from 32.6%. However, this was the party's first voter decrease in its history.

would transfer the Congo (his personal possession) to Belgium for certain concessions. The Social Democrats were confronted with the situation of voting to annex the Congo or to allow it to fall into the hands of an International Consortium.

Vandervelde, the prestigious head of the Belgian Socialsts, advocated annexation, on the grounds that Belgium would be less likely to "perpetuate colonial exploitation" than a regime of capitalist powers.[81] Since it would be under parliamentary control, the rights of the natives could be safe-guarded. However, a narrow majority of the Party refused to follow Vandervelde's lead. The resolution adopted by the Belgian S.P.D. declared that socialist deputies who favored annexation were "defying the principle agreed to by Congresses of the Party and the International.[82]

By the convening of the next Socialist International Congress in August, 1907, at Stuttgart, colonialism had developed into a central topic of debate among socialists. It stood not only as a concomitant of militarism, but was considered a topic which had to be addressed exclusively and directly by the International.[83] The only consensus centered around the

81. Braunthal, Op. cit., p. 315.

82. Ibid.

83. The Stuttgart Congress of 1907 discussed the question of

fact that colonialism, as managed by profit-mongering capitalists, had perpetrated evils and atrocities upon the colonial natives. In this sense, the socialists assumed a pristine quality of innocence with relation to the capitalists, the victims of historical guilt by association with the colonizing states.

The Colonial Commission of the Congress was comprised of members from eighteen states, with Van Kol once again acting as rapporteur. Exhaustive memoranda on the colonial policies of the major European states were discussed. However, the debate again revolved around the question whether colonialism should be rejected out of hand, or be utilized by socialists for developing the productive powers of mankind.

Edouard David of Germany, while criticizing the management of contemporary capitalism, resolved that the Commission accept the principle of colonization "on the grounds that the occupation and exploitation of the entire world are indispensable for the well-being of humanity."[84] He concluded, "Europe

militarism in a separate commission. Other central topics addressed were woman suffrage, emigration, and the party-syndicate relationship.

84. All citations from the Stuttgart Congress Colonial Commission are taken from Compte Rendu Congres Socialiste International de Stuttgart, (Brussels, 1908,) pp. 216-228 passim.

needs colonies. It does not even have enough of them. Without colonies, we should be comparable, from an economic standpoint, to China."

His German adversary, Ledebour, criticized David for not recognizing that "these abominations cannot be avoided," because they were the direct results of capitalism. He suggested that no progress in civilization could derive from a colonialist policy, and this oppression must be combatted on all fronts.

Terwagne, leading the Belgian delegation on the Commission, recommended that the following introduction be added to the resolution: "The Congress does not condemn in principle and for all time, every colonial policy; under a socialist regime, colonialization can be a work of civilization."

The leading French delegate on the Commission, Rouanet, agreed with Terwagne's motion, noting that "colonization is an historical fact; . . . it is all too easy to blame everything on capitalism and to saddle it with all the crimes of civilization." He suggested that Europeans use colonies to better the economic situation of their own countries.

David then moved that the Commission adopt the policy that "socialism needs the productive forces of the entire globe, destined to be put at the disposal of humanity, and to raise peoples of all colours and languages to the highest culture."

Further, he suggested that an integral aim of socialist colonial policy be the civilizing of the world.

Effectively reversing the Belgian socialist position of 1906, Terwagne asked, "Shall we leave the Congo in the state in which it is, or else do we want to better conditions there? Do not close the door to the future!" He insisted that the riches of the globe belong to all men, and must be utilized.

The resolution which was agreed to by a majority of the Commission (18-10) contained amendments by the reformists Rouanet and Van Kol. Also incorporated was an amendment submitted by the radical, Wurm, tying colonialism to militarism. Only David's amendment was rejected. The text of the majority resolution read as follows:

Majority Resolution

> The Congress, while noting that in general the utility and the necessity of colonies, in particular for the working class, is greatly exaggerated, does not condemn in principle and for all time, every colonial policy; under a socialist regime, colonization can be a work of civilization.
>
> Reaffirming its resolutions of Paris (1900) and of Amsterdam (1904), the Congress rejects the present colonization which, being intrinsically capitalistic, has no other objective than to conquer countries and to subjugate peoples in order to exploit them mercilessly for the profit of a very small minority, all the while increasing the burden of the proletarians of the mother country.
>
> Enemy of all exploitation of man by man, defender of all the oppressed without distinction of race, the Congress condemns this policy of robbery and conquest, this

> shameless application of the right of the strongest, which tramples on the rights of conquered peoples, and further notes that colonial policy increases the danger of international complications and of wars between colonizing countries . . .. The Congress declares that the socialist representatives have the duty to oppose unconditionally in all the parliaments this regime of unbridled exploitation and serfdom, which is prevalent in all the existing colonies, by insisting on reforms to better the lot of the natives, by seeing to the maintenance of their rights, by preventing all forms of exploitation and enslavement, and by working, by all the means at their disposal, to educate these peoples for independence.

The Colonial Commission transmitted this resolution to the Plenary Session of the Congress, while a minority group led by Ledebour, Wurm, DeLaporte, Bracke, and Karski submitted another version. The latter resolution incorporated the bulk of the majority resolution, but it deleted the first paragraph completely and inserted the following:

> The Congress is of the opinion that capitalist colonial policy, by its very essence, leads inevitable to the enslavement, forced labour, or extermination of the native population in the colonial domain. The civilizing mission claimed by capitalist society is only used as a pretext to cover its thirst for exploitation and conquest. Only socialist society will be able to offer to all peoples the possibility of fully developing their civilization.[85]

This minority was suggesting that any policy entailing forcible colonization would be counter-productive, but still alluded to European superiority and the need to develop the

85. All citations from Plenary Session, Ibid., pp. 284-329 passim.

civilizations of lower peoples, though only by example. Though the reformist majority favored an active policy of civilizing and profiting, a faction of this group showed a greater propensity to be responsible for the plight of the natives. The difference in outlook was not as great as the ensuing debate in the Plenary Session would indicate.

Van Kol defended tha majority resolution as realistic and positive, while the minority report revealed a "sombre spirit of despair and doubt." He specifically defended Dutch colonial practices, as having evolved from "killing, torture, and plunder" toward more peaceful and humanitarian principles. Since colonies were inevitable, he argued, they ought to be used to best advantage. He noted that the colonies were the only solution to the potential overpopulation of Europe and the increasing glut of European industrial goods. His most emotional plea, was to encourage the Congress to fulfill its "duty to work for the improvement of the backward peoples." The socialists must improve the degree of colonial civilization and see to it that the "millions of unhappy natives" be provided a better future.

Bernstein debated for the majority resolution by offering that abandonment of the colonies was a "utopian idea," which a growing political force could never subscribe to. He bluntly admitted that "a certain tutelage of the civilized peoples over

the uncivilized peoples is a necessity." Here, he quoted Marx, in Volume III of Capital: "The earth does not belong to a single people, but to humanity, and each people should manage it to the advantage of humanity."

His cohort, David, added that if the colonies were abandoned, only barbarism could truimph. He insisted that colonialiam was an historical necessity. "The colonies, too, must pass through capitalism. One does not pass from savagery to socialiam in a single leap."

The radical Karski countered that Marx had stated only that all peoples who had experienced the beginnings of capitalist development need go through the evolution completely. He blamed the Europeans for attempting to foist their civilization on those "asiatic peoples who possess a culture much more ancient than ours, and perhaps much more refined." He foresaw cultural development, rather than barbarism, as the consequence of a total abandonment of colonial practices.

Karl Kautsky then lent his sizable influence to the orthodox cause. He exhorted that the primary task of socialism was to liberate the "toiling masses of the world" from the chains of capital. Since colonialism was the direct antithesis of revolution, Europe could not force the blessings of civilization on the natives. He defined any colonial policy as being the

direct opposite of a civilizing policy.

However, even Kautsky was determined to civilize the savages. He suggested that they would accept the "help of a superior civilization" only if it were offered as friendly aid from European workers. Of course, this could occur only after the Socialist Revolution had transformed Europe into a co-operative commonwealth.

Van Kol proferred a final defense of the Commission's resolution with an exhortation to the members to be responsible for all the world's oppressed: "Why should we not help the workers of other continents, as we help the workers of Europe?" He reasoned, that, in order to gain their confidence, as Kautsky had suggested, something positive must be done for them. The Dutch socialists, he bragged, had won the confidence of thousands of Javanese by actively intervening in the colonies, while the Germans had no such accomplishment. Because the natives of Africa were cannibals, Van Kol asserted, "we must go there with weapons in our hands, even if Kautsky chooses to call that imperialism."

This last-ditch defense was insufficient to stop the defeat of the majority resolution in the Plenary Session, by a vote of 128-107, with Switzerland abstaining. The voting breakdown was of interest: every European socialist party whose

country had engaged in colonialism gave some, if not total support to the majority resolution. (See Table I.) There also appeared to be a relation between the parliamentary power of a socialist party, and its willingness to support the majority resolution. Inevitably, a party which was realistically in a situation in which it might assume control of government was likely to engage in "practical politics."

The unique voting system adopted at Stuttgart, a compromise of the principle of "one-country, one-vote" and proportional representation, allowed twenty votes for the largest parties, and two for the smallest. In effect, Europe, which had the vast majority of delegates and party members, was grossly underrepresented by this system. Had a proportional system been utilized, the Commission's majority resolution would have carried by a margin of two to one, since the vast preponderance of European delegates opted for it.

Though this vote signalled a victory of the orthodox attitude toward colonialism, the fundamental differences with the position of the reformists were inconsequential. The debate revolved around whether colonialism could be a useful "civilizing" tool in the hands of the socialists. However, both sides agreed that the natives were an inferior race, and did require some civilizing, though the orthodox group proposed that this

TABLE I

Voting on Minority Resolution of Colonial Commission
Stuttgart 1907

	total delegates	For	Against	Abst.	tropical colonial tradition (*=yes)	5% popular vote (*=yes)
Germany	289		20		*	*
Austria (German)	25		4			*
Bohemia	41		12			*
Belgium	27		15		*	*
Denmark	17		10		*	*
England	123	6	14		*	*
France	78	8	12		*	*
Holland	9		5		*	*
Italy	13	11	4		*	*
Sweden	19		10			*
S. Africa	1		2			
Austria (Italian)	25	4				
Austria (Ruthenian)	25	4				
Australia	1	2				
Argentina	3	2				
Bulgaria	5	4				
Spain	6	5				
USA	22	15			*	
Finland	2	2				*
Hungary	25	15				
Japan	1	2			*	
Poland	30	10				
Russia	63	20				
Rumania	4	5				
Serbia	1	2				
Norway	8	5				*
Switzerland	10			10		
Total	884	127	108	10		

Source: Compte Rendu Congres Socialiste Internationale de Stuttgart 1907, (Brussels, 1908,) pp. 325-326.

happen only through example. Only Karski credited the Asians with the possession of an equal of superior civilization.

Both groups were predominantly interested in the plight of the European worker in classic "Western" fashion. The orthodox group emphasized that the European proletariat must first reap the benefits of the revolution before the colonial question could be resolved. The reformists saw immediate benefits for Europe in embarking on a "positive colonial policy." The orthodox policy of avoidance was rooted in the Kaustkian belief that historic inevitability obviated the need for any revolutionary activity in the colonies. Indeed, any policy other than avoidance would distract them from the European Revolution. Minimally, the radicals and the reformists agreed that capitalist colonialism was evil and poorly managed. Eventual independence for the colonies was a consensual goal.

Thus, colonialism was "condemned in principle," but not by a majority of European socialists. These delegates voted overwhelmingly in favor of a "positive socialist colonial policy." Further, this Congress' condemnation was not meant to imply international equality. It decried capitalist management of colonies, while avoiding any collective responsibility for them.

With this resolution, the International Congress laid to rest the colonial issue. This occurence is most likely tied

to the fact that, by 1910, few socialists envisaged a war starting over a colonial issue. Temporarily defeated, the alliance of the nationalists and revisionists would continue its struggle against orthodox Marxism in the subsequent battle on militarism and entry into the First World War. However, any united, international advocacy of "realistic colonialism" by socialists, had ceased.

At this time, the Russian socialists were only beginning to make their mark on the international socialist movement. Initially, the Bolsheviks, led by Nikolai Bukharin and V. I. Lenin, espoused the Western orthodox position on colonialism.

Bukharin noted that colonies were a regressive factor, slowing the pace of revolution, because they provided a colossal income to the great powers, allowing them to raise workers' wages at the expense of the colonial savages. The main reason that Europe and America had been free from socialist revolution had been because a "safety valve was opened in the form of colonial Policy."[86]

Lenin found some virtue in colonialism, in 1907, because it brought the colonies closer to the class tensions of Europe.

86. Nikolai Bukharin, Imperialism and World Economy, (New York, 1919,) p. 165.

The example of European socialism could be better transmitted to the underdeveloped areas of the world through it, and the natives would be better able to "wage a victorious struggle against the oppressors."[87]

Lenin praised Kautsky's defense of the Minority Resolution at Stuttgart, on the grounds that colonialism was based on enslavement. The civilizing potential of colonialism, Lenin stated, was bankrupt: "The bourgeoisie was introducing virtual slavery into the colonies and subjecting the native populations to untold indignities and violence, 'civilizing' them by the spread of alcohol and syphilis."[88]

He agreed with Engels that imperialism possessed the capacity to create privileged categories of workers and break them away from the broad mass of the proletariat. By bribing this upper stratum of the lower classes, imperialism "fosters, shapes, and reinforces opportunism."[89]

Lenin's concluding "Western" reason for depicting colonialism as regressive was that the economic position of the Western proletariat was undermined by the colonies. The capitalists

87. V. I. Lenin, Polnoe Sobranie Sochineniya, Vol. XVI, (Moscow, 1961,) p. 67.

88. Ibid., p. 68.

89. Ibid., Vol. XXVII, p. 374.

were provided an effective alternative not only to market their products, but also to seek cheap labor. European labor would lose much bargaining power, as it became less essential in the production process.

In his essay, Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, Lenin acknowledged the prior contributions of J. A. Hobson and Rudolf Hilferding, by labelling colonialism as "economically inspired by monopoly capital."[90] Imperialism, the "foreign policy of finance capital," was necessarily characterized by domination and violence.

This piece was written, partly to refute the concept of "Ultra-Imperialism" set forth by Karl Kautsky.[91] The German held that, though socialists ought to fight against annexation, imperialism was less likely to cause a major war because the major colonizers were combining in their colonial pursuits. This union of world imperialisms would provide for joint exploitation of colonial wealth and improve great-power relations.

90. V. I. Lenin, Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism, (New York, 1939,) p. 1.

91. Kautsky introduced the term, "Ultra-Imperialism" in an article in Die Neue Zeit in 1913, calling it a "phase of the joint exploitation of the world by internationally combined finance capital." Lenin's response was most likely so strong, because he felt betrayed by this past champion of Marxist orthodoxy. Kautsky was merely labelling the prevailing socialist attitude, that colonialism would not likely lead to war.

Lenin insisted that ultra-imperialism was "impossible."[92]

However, Lenin was not destined to lead a "Western" socialist party, and his instinct as a Russian revolutionary drew him from his conditioned Marxian position. He operated within the concept of the "Asiatic Mode of Production" until 1917, but as early as 1906, he began to water down the term "asiatic" into "medieval" or "patriarchal."[93] Immediately after the October Revolution, he applied the concept of nationalism to the Asiatic tribes of Russia.

Thus, he took a more "Eastern" approach to the colonial question. He held that capitalism must be attacked at its weakest point (the underdeveloped world) and suggested that self-determination and socialism were possible in the non-industrial states of Asia. This attitude imputed racial and cultural equality to the Asiatics. It acknowledged that the Eastern socialist revolution would not only be temporally prior to that of the West, but also that it possessed equal or greater significance.

This altered position was likely a tactical expedient, with the aim of hoping to disunite the Asiatic tribes of Russia from either the Tsarist or "white" cause, and contributing to a favorable outcome of the Russian Civil War. Lenin, thereby,

92. V. I. Lenin, Imperialism, Op. cit., p. 109.

93. Lichtheim, Op. cit., p. 87.

harnessed nationalism as a potent revolutionary force, and established and solidified his political position. In effect, this "Eastern View" toward the colonies (or in his case, the Asiatic tribes,) was a self-serving political tactic, used just as in the West, to gain local popular support and political power.

Even Italy experienced the shock effects of the colonial question upon socialism, though several years after it had subsided in the rest of Europe. In 1911, the Government intended to annex Tripolitania and declare war against the decadent Turkish Empire. The Socialist Party protested against this as a frivolous adventure. However, a reformist wing, led by Bissolati and Bonomi, argued vehemently for the war credits requested. In 1912, at the Congress of Reggio Emilia, the reformist minority split from the party, as the young, radical leader, Benito Mussloini, took control of the central party.[94]

Conclusions

European socialism, and primarily those socialists of the Second International, were unable to transcend their parochial proclivities and to deal with colonialism on the ethical basis demanded by their equalitarian ideology. The reasons for this

94. Braunthal, Op. cit., pp. 317-318.

failure can be traced to the ideological and political dilemmas faced by Karl Marx and his heirs.

A definite "Western" outlook was always prevalent in socialist ideology. The philosophy grew out of the contradictions emanating from Western, industrial states, and was geared to deal exclusively with these problems. The Marxian legacy emphasized the need to industrialize and to pass through the various modes of production enroute to socialism. In retrospect, this historic progression defines the path taken by a minority of the world's states. To most, it was irrelevant. Europe became the focal point, according to European socialists, and her example had to be emulated. The national framework into which this ideology was injected also reinforced this Western attitude. In the nineteenth century, Europe became infected with nationalism, and increasingly, any movement which would win popular support, would possess some nationalistic attributes. A minimum requirement for this support was that the party work in the interest of the European masses. Thus, the paradox: in order to gain the requisite support of Europeans, the socialists were forced to employ political tactics which de-emphasized and perverted the fundamental concept of universal equality.

Responses to this dilemma were posed by two conflicting schools of thought. However, they possessed certain commonal-

ities. Inherent in the entire debate was the recognition of European economic and cultural superiority. Non-Europeans were rarely credited with the ability to attain independence, much less socialism, without at least minimum guidance from Europe. The colonies were invariably treated purely as economic entities by the "Western" outlook.

A touchstone of all Western socialists was the incapacity and inefficiency of colonialism, as managed by capitalists. This common acknowledgement of selfish capitalist interests was understandable, since any attempt to discredit capitalism was instrumental in adding to socialist power. However, this criticism amounted to an opportunistic exploitation of historical guilt, rather than an inherent indictment of the inequalities of colonialism.

Socialism's apparent antipathy for foreign policy issues was a logical consequence of the domestic roots of the philosophy. This, however, helped keep the colonial question a peripheral issue for socialists until it was utterly unavoidable. Then, the response was necessarily confused, since little practical policy on the matter had been formulated. The initial response, then as now, was the conditioned socialist reflex: to quote from orthodox Marxist scripture.

These common attributes shaped the two basic Western re-

sponses to the colonial question: orthodox and reformist.

The orthodox school emphasized the goal of European revolution, and adhered strictly to the Marxian principle of increasing misery. They evaluated colonies as these dependencies affected the inevitability of the revolution and the economic situation of the European worker. Colonies could only be considered advantageous, if they accelerated the inevitable revolution.

From these tenets derive what will be labelled the Western orthodox "policy of avoidance" toward the colonies. Since its primary concern was with Europe, this faction felt no overriding responsibility toward the tropical colonies, beyond the ambiguous "unity of the oppressed" slogan of socialism. However, it became apparent that colonies were rich in resources of wealth to the metropole, placing capitalism in a position to bribe the proletariat with benefits. The presence of colonies endangered the trend toward increasing class-consciousness.

Additionally, colonies increased the likelihood of a European war because of the higher statistical probability of conflict between adjacent colonizing garrisons. This impending war, it was commonly felt before 1910, would set back the revolution by galvanizing nationalist tendencies and offering

excusses for the repression of socialist revolutionaries. Many potential socialists would also be killed fighting the war. Finally, much of the socialist reaction toward militarism did stem from a bona fide sense of pacifism.

The orthodox Marxists were, therefore, forced into this ideological position. They could not defend even a benign form of colonialism, because its very existence endangered their ultimate goal of revolution. They were forced to fabricate theories which called for its complete abandonment. They retreated to their only defensible position: that of ignoring and avoiding colonial policy by condemning it "in principle" and suggesting that all colonies be set free. A sense of collective responsibility was unallowable.

The Western reformists were concerned with the immediate achievements of socialist and liberal reforms. Since they ceased believing in the inevitability of revolution they welcomed any improvement of the workers' position. They saw, in benign colonialism, a tool which could produce these results.

Their tactic of doctrinal flexibility lent itself to garnering popular support, but also enslaved the revisionists to the whims of public opinion. As a group, they demanded a better-managed, more humane brand of colonialism, as well as benefits for the Europeans, very much in the liberal tradition.

However, other popular tendencies also polluted this altruistic stance. Many espoused a certain national superiority, and demanded special colonial considerations. Several viewed colonialism as a method to enhance one's state's relative military power and influence. Others were simply jingoists, caught by the spirit of the age.

However, a small number of notable exceptions also manifested some sense of compassion and responsibility for the tropical natives. They proposed that the indigenous tribes share in the wealth created by colonial trade. Though they often spoke in the grandiloquent terms of "enhancing international civilization," there was, no doubt, an intention to assume some responsibility for the physical and economic well-being of the natives.

All reformists of this period engaged in what Semmel calls "Social Imperialism," or the attempt to create a mass base for imperialism by providing material and psychic rewards for the European worker.[95] However, this last group of reformists adds a new dimension to this phenomenon. It attempts to make imperialism more palatable to all involved, by offering humane and charitable management of colonies, while improving the physical situation in the colonies.

95. Semmel, Op. cit., p. 1.

Both Western attitudes fail as pure expressions of the egalitarianism which pervades socialist theory. Though the "Eastern" view lends significance to the equality of non-European politics and cultures, it remains the self-serving, instrumental tool of a revolutionary, hoping to eventually subjugate the same tribes he incited toward self-determination and socialism. In practice, it became the tool of Great-Russian chauvinism, following the Russian Civil War.

Bibliography

Original Sources:

Compte Rendu Congres Socialiste International d'Amsterdam 1904. Le Secretariat du Bureau Socialiste Interantionale: Brussels, 1904.

Compte Rendu Congres Socialiste Internationale de Stuttgart 1907. Le Secretariat du Bureau Socialiste Internationale: Brussels, 1908.

Fabian Tracts No. 1-125. London: The Fabian Society, 1908.

Literature:

Avinieri, Shlomo. The Social and Political Thought of Karl Marx. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Bernstein, Edward. Evolutionary Socialism: A Criticism and Affirmation. New York: B. W. Huebsch, 1909.

Betts, Raymond F. Assimilation and Association in French Colonial Theory 1890-1914. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Boersner, Demetrio. The Bolsheviks and the National and Colonial Question 1917- 1928. Geneva: University of Geneva Press, 1957.

Braunthal, Julius. History of the International 1864-1914. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967.

Brunschwig, Henri. French Colonialism: Myths and Realities. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.

Bukharin, Nikolai. Imperialism and World Economy. New York: International Publishers, 1919.

Carr, Edward H. The Bolshevik Revolution: 1917-1923 (Volume I). New York: MacMillan Co., 1951.

Carrere, Helene d'Encasse and Schram, Stuart R. Marxism and Asia. Baltimore, Penguin, 1969.

Cole, Margaret. The Story of Fabian Socialism. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1961.

Drachkovitch, Milorad M. The Revolutionary Internationals 1864-1943. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1966.

Dutt, R. Palme. The Internationale. London: Lawrence Wishart, 1966.

Fainsod, Merle. International Socialism and the World War. New York: Octagon, 1966.

Fieldhouse, D. K. Economics and Empire. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1973.

Foster, W. Z. A History of the Three Internationals. New York: International Publishers, 1955.

Fried, Albert and Sanders, Ronald, ed. Socialist Thought: A Documentary History. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1964.

Frolich, Paul. Rosa Luxemburg: Her Life and Work. New York: Howard Fertig, 1969.

Galenson, Walter. Labor in Norway. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Hyndman, H. M. The Awakening of Asia. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1919.

Hyndman, H. M. The Historical Basis of Socialism. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench and Co., 1883.

Joll, James. The Second International 1889-1914. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1956.

Kirkup, Thomas. A History of Socialism. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913.

Langer, William L. The Diplomacy of Imperialism. Ner York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1935.

Lenin, Vladimir I. Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism. New York: International Publishers, 1939.

Lenin, Vladimir I. Polne Sobranie Sochineniya (Collected Works) Volumes XVI, XVII, XXVI. Moscow: State Publishing House of Political Literature, 1961.

Lichtheim, George. "Marx and the Asiatic Mode of Production", St. Antony's Papers No.14, Far Eastern Affairs. Carbondale: Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1961.

Lichtheim, George. The Origins of Socialism. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969.

Liebknecht, Karl, Luxemburg, Rosa, and Mehring, Franz. The Crisis in German Social Democracy (The Junius Pamphlet). New York: The Socialist Publication Society, 1918.

Lorwin, Val R. The French Labor Movement. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Lowe, Donald M. The Function of "China" in Marx, Lenin, and Mao. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1966.

Luxemburg, Rosa. The Accumulation of Capital. London: Routledge and Paul, 1951.

Luxemburg, Rosa. Selected Political Writings. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.

MacKenzie, Norman. Socialism: A Short History. London: Hutchinson and Co., 1966.

Maehl, William H. German Militarism and Socialism. Lincoln: Nebraska Wesleyan Press, 1968.

Marcuse, Herbert. Soviet Marxism: A Critical Analysis. New York: Columbia University Press, 1958.

Marx, Karl. Capital. Moscow: Foreing Languages Publiching Institute, 1959.

Marx, Karl. Marx on China 1853-1860. London: Lawrence Wishart, 1951.

Marx, Karl. The Poverty of Philosophy. New York: International Publishers, 1967.

Marx, Karl and Engels, Frederick. On Colonialism. New York: International Publishers, 1972.

McBriar, A. M. Fabian Socialism and English Politics 1884-1918. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Merriam, Charles E. and Barnes, Harry E., ed. A History of Political Theories. New York: MacMillan Co., 1924.

Meyer, Alfred. Marxism: The Unity of Theory and Practice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Murphy, Agnes. The Ideology of French Imperialism 1871-1881. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1948.

Nettl, J. P. Rosa Luxemburg (Two Volumes). London: Oxford University Press, 1966.

Noland, Aaron. The Founding of the French Socialist Party (1893-1905). Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.

Pease, Edward R. The History of the Fabian Society. London: Frank Cass, 1963.

Semmel, Bernard. Imperialism and Social Reform. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1968.

Shaw, George Bernard, ed. Fabianism and the Empire: A Manifesto by the Fabian Society. London: Chiswick Press, 1900.

Taylor, Overton H. The Classical Liberalism, Marxism, and the Twentieth Century. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Thornton, A. P. The Imperial Idea and Its Enemies. Garden City, New York: Coubleday, 1968.

Tsuzuki, Chushichi. H.M. Hyndman and British Socialism. London: Oxford University Press, 1961.

Tucker, Robert C., ed. The Marx-Engels Reader. New York: W. W. Norton, 1972.

Tucker, Robert C. The Marxian Revolutionary Idea. New York: W. W. Norton, 1969.

Ulam, Adam B. The Unfinished Revolution. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.

Weinstein, Harold R. Jean Jaures: A Study of Patriotism in the French Socialist Movement. New York: Columbia University Press, 1936.

Wittfogel, Karl A. Oriental Despotism: A Comparative Study of Total Power. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957.

Wolfe, Martin, ed. The Economic Causes of Imperialism. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

VITA

Thomas R. Fedyszyn was born November 25, 1947 in Dunkirk, New York. After graduating from Cardinal Mindszenty High School, in 1965, he entered the U.S. Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland. At the Academy, he held a position on the Brigade staff, and graduated, with distinction, in 1969, majoring in international relations. Upon commissioning, he served aboard destroyers homeported in Japan, San Diego, California, and Norfolk, Virginia. Lt. Fedyszyn is presently a second year graduate student in political science at the Johns Hopkins University, and will join the faculty of the Political Science Dept. of the Naval Academy in September, 1975.

Thesis 161005
F25158 Fedyszyn
European socialism
and the colonial ques-
tion (1848-1918).

Thesis 161005
F25158 Fedyszyn
European socialism
and the colonial ques-
tion (1848-1918).

thesF25158
European socialism and the colonial ques
3 2768 002 13413 2
DUDLEY KNOX LIBRARY